



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ENGLISH TEACHERS COLUMN

(Continued from page 159)

the roll the number 201, the second 202, etc. Use a hundred in each case to correspond to the period. Inform each pupil of his class register number and require him to place it in the upper right-hand corner of all his papers. This method of numbering materially expedites the handling of papers in large classes. A pupil can quickly arrange the papers numerically, making it much easier to enter grades on the register. Overdue papers are quickly located this way. Here is a paper bearing the number 512 under the name. The teacher instantly turns to her fifth period roll and to 12 and the name is located.

Caution

DO NOT TRY to teach everything in the way of composition in one lesson or even in one month and not even to your senior class. You cannot do it. Go slow at first. Do not hurry your pupils into original work before they have a knowledge of the mechanics of writing. Take time at the beginning of the session to make sure that all the members of the class know what constitutes a sentence and can put that knowledge into practice in writing. Don't start them to writing a story in which there will be conversation until you are sure that they know how to paragraph and punctuate conversation. Do not be afraid that any original ideas that your pupils may have will become desiccated and blow away while you are drilling on the mechanics of writing. If you are, nevertheless, fearful of this calamity occurring, you can make use of the oral composition period to preserve any originality that is in danger of evaporating. Don't try to lay the foundation and build the superstructure at the same time. If you will only take time to drill your class on the mechanics of writing before letting them begin the original composition work, you will save yourself a great deal of the drudgery of correction and your pupils the drudgery of writing and rewriting for errors in the mechanics of composition which should not have been made in the first place and therefore save the pupil much discouragement and probably prevent his acquiring a dislike to composition work.

It is easy in the world to live after the world's opinions; it is easy in solitude to live after our own; but the great man is he who in the midst of the crowd keeps with perfect sweetness the independence of solitude.—Emerson.

The more extensive a man's knowledge of what he has done, the greater will be his power of knowing what to do.—Disraeli.

THE SPANISH COLUMN

Conducted By DR. A. A. SHAPIRO

The Importance of Latin for the Study of Spanish

SPANISH IS ONE of the several languages descended from Latin. It is important, therefore, for the teacher to utilize to a practical extent the close relation actually existing between the parent Latin and the descendant Spanish. Whether Latin has theoretical value as a discipline does not concern us beside the obvious fact that it is practically helpful in studying Spanish. The point at issue, then, is whether Latin is worth while enough to justify the outlay of time on it in connection with further study of a Romance language—here, the Spanish.

The exceptional student without previous knowledge of Latin can take up Spanish and do as well in it, practically, as the Latinist—yet this is only a partial truth, for it takes a rare non-Latinist to do very good work, whereas the Latinists who give exceptionally fine results are comparatively frequent.¹ The Latinist, moreover, studies Spanish economically. The word *canicula*, not a common word in texts, which has no associations to the non-Latinist but simply means *dog-days*, is one of a long chain of related words and ideas to the Latinist. Words like *mar*, *muro*, *pensar*, *piel*, *poner*, *por*, *probar*, *rey*, *rogar*, *si*, *tierra*; and then, *algo*, *hoy*, *manzana*, *mañana*—such words require a minimum of memory effort from the Latinist. Construction—the use of the subjunctive for instance, the agreement of adjectives in gender and number with the substitute modified—is more readily understood and thoroughly mastered by your Latin student. The Latin student has no real difficulty with the gender of the Spanish words *dia* as masculine and *mano* as feminine, because he understands the gender of the Latin words *dies* and *manus*. So, too, the teacher finds the pupil with a Latin preparation more capable of distinguish-

¹ In two sections of beginning Spanish at the University of North Carolina, fall term, 1921, fourteen students had had no Latin and twenty-one had had it. Of the fourteen, one made a 2 (90-95); two made a 3 (80-90); one made a 4 (70-80); ten made a 6 (failure). Of the twenty-one, two made a 1 (95-100); two made a 2; four made a 3; nine made a 4; four made a 6. Of the non-Latinists, two boys repeated the course, one making a 4 and the other a 1. Using this as the basis of comparison, the Latinists with 50 per cent more students had 100 per cent more students in the grades 1, 2, and 3; and half the number of the non-Latinists in 6. The most significant point is that of the average students: the Latinists had 450 per cent what the non-Latinists had.

The average for the non-Latinists was 4-9/14; for the Latinists, 3-4/21. Of those who took Latin, the average was just three years. Of three boys who went on with Latin in college, one received 6 in Latin and did not take the Spanish examination; one received 4 in Latin and 4 in Spanish; and the third received 2 in Latin and 2 in Spanish—a fortuitous coincidence, perhaps, but somewhat of a confirmation of our thesis of the close correspondence of Latin and Spanish.

The non-Latinist who made the 1 in Spanish is an exceptional student—his freshman year in college netted ten 1's and six 2's. The 6 in Spanish was due to the fact that he had to drop the subject owing to the press of other work.

Of the two Latinists making 6 in Spanish but coming in with good entrance certificates, one had poor marks in all freshman subjects (4-6-6; 4-6-4; 6-4-6-3), showing that his entrance certificate had overrated him. The other made up his Spanish with a mark of 3, his other marks being also good (2-3-6 Spanish made up to 3; 4-3-2-3).

ing between *haber* and *tener*—even between such finer idioms as *lo tiene escrito* and *lo ha escrito*. The average non-Latinist usually flounders when he is told that the subjunctive is occasionally used as a plu-perfect indicative—and will not (rather than can not) understand it. The Latinist has more “language sense”—is more used to handling what apparatus criticus may be set before him. That all this depends on the fact that it is usually the better students who elect Latin and that it is they who can do the work better may be so; yet there is a fair proportion of average and sub-average students taking Latin, and their work in Spanish is somewhat higher than that of the students of the same level of general ability who have not taken Latin (see footnote one above). To all this, of course, one rejoinder can be made: Even if the Latin student does learn Spanish more readily, does the time spent in Latin justify itself by the time saved in Spanish? The query cannot be answered categorically, for its answer depends largely on the broader question: What is the purpose of the public school?

The whole matter of the function in the community of the high school has been obscured by the vocationalists. Recognizing, as they properly do, that the school is to equip young people for life, they have introduced professional subjects and trade work in the schools—and then they have mistaken profession and trade for the school. This is a profound misconception of the duties of the high school. There are boys and girls who can not possibly do conventional high school work—for these, if they are to continue in school beyond the grades, special types of vocational schools must be rendered available (and here, as usual, the small or rural community is handicapped). But the normal type of high school, notwithstanding these facts, is not a trade or a professional school—it is a cultural and social (intellectual?) influence, a quiet backwater, where youths of the adolescent age may grow tranquilly in bodily strength and spiritual beauty until they have been prepared for their further work—college or immediate social usefulness. At the high school age, the average boy does not know—tragically enough, he can not learn at home—how to inquire, how to use his natural desire to know, how to find the answers which his cosmic curiosity puts to him. In two or three years, the edge of this curiosity is blunted, he takes things for granted, he becomes routine, Philistine. It is pathetic to compare the questions a lad of fifteen, sixteen, or even seventeen will put with the utter passivity and receptivity of the average college sophomore. The pupil must not merely be given knowledge; he must be taught to inquire for knowledge—and what to do with it if he gets it.

Some reformers, sensing intangible imperfections in

education, have evolved one or another cure-all, but most of these educators-with-a-mission have been unwilling to recognize the essentially artificial character of schools. The word itself, “artificial,” has nothing degrading or derogatory about it. Our social life is ordered in artificial ways, and often well ordered. Inspired, however, by Rousseau, Marx, and others of the -ism type of reformers, some visionaries have been deluded into trying to restore a brain-spun Golden Age—have tried to turn back the hands of time to zero. Language teachers have felt the tendency as much as any. Direct methods, natural systems, fathered often by intellectual kin of the professorial bootblack, have been brought out fresh every season. Seas of ink have been spilled, and lecture platforms have resounded to much windy rhetoric in the effort to make language taught so as to reproduce life—and put someone’s name before the public.

But: a thirty-five week school year, of five periods of forty minutes each, means not much more than twelve days of eight hours each. Who would expect a boy, if he went to a foreign country, to learn a language in twelve days of eight hours? or even three school years—thirty-six such days? I take no account of outside preparation, for your genuine *Naturmensch* does not require artificial self-coaching—he grows up happily and blithely in the springtime of life. I do not urge, either, to push the pendulum to the other extreme. Yet education is essentially artificial. Schools are man-made, storehouses where knowledge is accumulated, laboratories where character is studied and often formed. This all requires the intervention of teachers, of men and women, is by definition artificial. That language should be made useful no one will deny. That oral work is an integral part of language study is self-evident, for the oral language is at the base of all other. But to say that oral work is all there is to language study, to forget that a primarily reading knowledge of a foreign language is handier to ninety-nine and a primarily speaking knowledge more useful to one, is tantamount to asking each generation of chemists to forget the accumulated store of knowledge of chemistry and start out on fresh rediscoveries by primitive gropings and happy accidents.

Study of Spanish, then, should be thorough, fundamental; and most work can be done by intensive study. To say that Latin is indispensable (I had almost said a *sine qua non*) for such intensive study of Spanish is saying too much; but certainly, for a thorough and abiding acquaintance with Spanish, the Latin more than pays its way. The study of Spanish philology is here as helpful to the teacher of Spanish grammar and literature as the study of phonetics is specifically for pronunciation—no teacher but is stronger for a knowl-

edge of philology, and no student but appreciates and learns better his Spanish if he has had previous training in Latin.²

RE-EXAMINE YOUR FAULTY ENGLISH

FOR EIGHT hours it was my privilege to listen to the affirmative side of the League of Nations question as presented in last year's semi-finals at Chapel Hill. Fourteen teams—twenty-eight speakers—harangued four other judges and myself a half hour at a time. From all parts of the state they came, from large schools and small schools, from the east and the west, and from the north and the south. There were wide-eyed boys in their first pairs of long trousers and tall six-footers who had grown too fast; demure girls in curls, and more knowing ones with bobbed hair and bobbed skirts.

Presumably what we five men heard on that day was above the average of English used in the high schools. Out of several hundred teams which had started in the race, here were fourteen which had survived. They had used their speeches several times, had had the benefit of considerable experience and advice (perhaps more than they realized at times) and, too, had ironed out most of the wrinkles in the way of faulty grammar and poor logic.

Left, then, to their own resources, they erred most noticeably in the matter of pronunciation. The errors were many and strange! By all odds the most common fault was the sound given to *e* when coupled with an *n* or an *m*. Intensive became "intinsive"; henceforth, "hinchforth"; ends, "inds"; chemical, "chimi-cal"; general, "gneral",—and so on *ad infinitum*. At least thirty words were mistreated in this way time and again during the eight hours.

After this Irishism, the next greatest offender was the *ou* sound in such words as "about", council", and "found". These became "abaout", "caouncil", and "faound". From a long list culled, these three must stand as examples.

But while these two types of error may attempt some sort of defence by claiming colloquial authority, the next group—that of mere slovenly enunciation—cannot escape so happily. Some examples which I jotted down in this class are: "goverment" (no *n*

sound), "perticlery" (particularly), "regalation" (regulation), "probally" (probably), "continya" (continue) "reccanise" (recognise) "Amurica" (America), "denounciation" (denunciation), and a whole host of lost *g* sounds in such words as leading, thinking, feeling, and profiting.

Faulty accent played, perhaps, a less significant part than one might expect. The *Mon-roé doctrine* was almost invariably the "Mon-roé doctrine", i-dé-a was "i-dea", and po-licé-man was "pó-lice-man."

Some, however, were so careful to stand up straight that they made "of-ten" of *often*. But the "prize" pronunciation of all to me—and one in which about half of the twenty-eight offended—was in the word used perhaps more often than any other—*league*. This became in some unaccountable way "lig",—the "Lig of Nations", if you please.

A note of this kind is likely to distort the conditions by the very fact that it centers on but one phase of the debate. Yet this one phase is all that the writer is, for the present, interested in. Grammar, logic, sentence structure, and all of the countless mechanical requirements of composition are likely to be as well in hand as possible after the severe practice that the debaters have had before they get into the semi-finals. The plea here is simply for more attention to pronunciation and the only reason that the plea is made is that the writer is frankly interested in high school English. It would seem that more attention might be placed on this phase of oral English. Otherwise, the only supposition must be that when you leave the student to his own resources, when he is in a debating hall with no one to help him, no teacher to correct him, or no friend to counsel, when, in short, he is his own self, he falls into a careless vulgarity of pronunciation and enunciation which does not help him with a crotchety judge.—C. A. HIBBARD.

A ROMANCE OF EDUCATION

By R. SHERMAN CLARK
Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburg, Pa.

A ROMANCE OF EDUCATION for and in industry that can carry a lesson to nearly every American business center or industrial interest has been going on in Pittsburgh in recent years, and is today unfolding in a startling way.

It is built upon the fore-seeing genius of the great industrialist, Andrew Carnegie, and centers in the night work of the Carnegie Institute of Technology—an institution which, in effect, has become a great university for industry and the arts, functioning in the center of one of the world's foremost industrial regions.

² I was once asked what utility there is in "philology," the science of language change. Instead of answering my questioner directly, I showed him some reprints of old Spanish texts—and from these we naturally wandered off into questions of literature, history, philosophy, and religion, things in which he is intensely interested and on which philology sheds much light. The text had become a pretext. Of course, the language teacher's interest in language change, in philology, is a different interest; but the whole matter, it is evident, can be dried up at the source or rendered instinct with life according as one approaches it.

As for "practical utility," the teacher with a knowledge of philology is much better qualified to teach than the one who has studied a minimum of language. The connoisseur knows his subject better than the amateur.